

REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24-29, 31-33, 35-37, 39, 40, and 42 are currently amended. Claims 2 and 23 are cancelled. No claims are newly added by this amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 20-23, 25, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Oki, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0161633; "Oki"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amendments

Independent Claim 1 has been amended so as to incorporate the limitation recited in dependent Claim 2 and the limitation that advertisement is performed in the same form as that of a link between IP/MPLS nodes. Support for the latter limitation can be found, for example, in the recitation on page 25, lines 15-19, of the specification.

Similarly, independent Claim 22 has been amended so as to incorporate the limitation recited in dependent Claim 23 and the limitation that advertisement is performed in the same form as that of a link between IP/MPLS nodes.

Independent Claim 20 has been amended so as to incorporate limitations corresponding to those incorporated in Claims 1 and 22.

Claims 2 and 23 have been cancelled. The dependency of Claims 3, 25, and 42 has been amended so as to conform to the cancellation of Claims 2 and 23.

Arguments

With respect to the limitations recited in original Claims 2 and 23, now incorporated into independent Claims 1, 20, and 22, the Examiner makes reference to FIG. 23 and paragraph 403 of Oki. However, paragraph 403 of Oki merely discloses that a flooding section 21C (FIG. 23) provided in a GMPLS controller 10C in a photonic router communicates link state information which has been collected from its own node and other nodes to adjacent nodes. FIG. 23 and paragraph 403 of Oki fail to even mention the limitation of a router LSA, let alone the limitation of advertising link state information of a GMPLS label path of a packet layer by a router LSA as a normal link in the IP/MPLS node.

In addition, Oki neither discloses nor suggests the limitation of advertising link state information of a GMPLS label path of a packet layer in the same form as that of a link between IP/MPLS nodes, which has been newly incorporated into independent Claims 1, 20, and 22.

With such distinctive features recited in independent Claims 1, 20, and 22, the link state information of the GMPLS label path of the packet layer in the GMPLS network can be advertised in a form acceptable by the IP/MPLS node (page 7, lines 18-20, of the specification). Such an advantage cannot be anticipated from Oki. Rejected dependent Claims 3, 21, 25, 42, and 43 should be allowed at least by virtue of their dependency on the independent claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that

Claims 1-3, 20-23, 25, 42, and 43 define patentable subject matter over Oki. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 4-19, 24, and 26-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Allowable dependent Claims 4-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-18, which directly refer to dependent Claim 2, have been rewritten into independent form by incorporating the limitations recited in original independent Claim 1 and original dependent Claim 2. Allowable dependent Claim 24, which directly refers to independent Claim 22, has been rewritten into independent form by incorporating the limitations recited in original independent Claim 22. Allowable dependent Claims 26-29, 31-33, 35-37, and 39-40, which directly refer to dependent Claim 23, have been rewritten into independent form by incorporating the limitations recited in original independent Claim 22 and original dependent Claim 23. Therefore, Claims 4-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-18, 24, 26-29, 31-33, 35-37, and 39-40 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 24, 2009

By: /Gregory A. Stobbs/
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/dec

14701908.1